

MSR Stakeholder Working Group
Orange/Villa Park/Orange Sphere of Influence
April 23, 2004

Meeting Notes

The meeting began at approximately 10:00 am.

Public Comment Period:

Three members of the audience voiced comments to the Stakeholder Working Group (SWG). Roughly restated, the main comment topics related to:

- ◆ Concern that the SWG give consideration to all the prior planning efforts done on behalf of the canyon areas to date and that value be given to the quality of life of the canyon residents
- ◆ Requests to move the public comment period to the end of the meetings; add alternates to the general distribution list for meetings and materials and provide them with working group notebooks; change the time of the meetings to allow those who work to attend
- ◆ Content of some press articles regarding the SWG process has not been constructive nor helpful to the success of the MSR process

Agenda/Desired Outcomes:

The facilitator reviewed the intended focus of the meeting and desired outcomes as follows:

- ◆ Increased common understanding among WG members about the purpose and scope of the MSR prototype
- ◆ Confirmation that data is responsive and properly formatted
- ◆ Confirmation and/or augmentation of 20-year questions that are generated by the data (first half of data)
- ◆ Open dialogue among WG participants

Review of MSR Purpose and Scope

For the benefit of the newer SWG members and the public in attendance, LAFCO staff provided a handout and brief PowerPoint presentation on the overall purpose and scope of the Municipal Service Review program.

Trending Data Presentation

LAFCO consultant Jennifer Christian, Conrad and Associates, began the program with a brief overview of the objectives of the trending data presentation. She explained that the presentation would cover the first four of the eight macro issue categories as specified by the SWG in the previous meeting including: demographics, traffic, land use/open space, and general municipal

services. The next meeting would address trending data for the remaining four macro issue categories.

Prior to the presentation of the data itself LAFCO staff used a visual outline to refresh for the group the purpose of the trending data process:

- ◆ To set the foundation for dialogue that will help the SWG identify the future-focused services questions it will choose to address more in-depth through the technical advisory committee (TAC) process
- ◆ To prioritize the most important questions the SWG selects for closer study as time and resources are limited
- ◆ The TAC process will provide information that will help the Working Group determine if there are conclusions, options & alternatives that it can agree to and therefore may become the basis of the SWG 20-year “vision framework.”
- ◆ The goal at the end of the SWG meeting process is for each SWG member to have a document that represents the work of the group.
- ◆ The “vision framework” is intended to be a set of options and/or alternatives that each member can use at their own discretion as they plan for the future.

Demographics

The SWG was presented with an overview of demographic data on population, housing, age, and employment. Graphs and interactive maps were used to illustrate current and in most cases, 20-year projected impacts to the MSR focus area, which included the Silverado/Modjeska Specific Plan area. Data sources were identified for each data category. The demographic data presentation was wrapped up with two stated conclusions:

- ◆ Demographic changes will occur in population, housing, age, and employment
- ◆ Demographic changes will force changes in: land use and open space resources, traffic, general municipal services

A general comment was made by a SWG member that while the illustrative graphs were good, raw numbers may be a better informational tool than percentages. A more specific question was raised regarding the employment projection data for the East Orange area. The consultant agreed to verify the data and follow-up with the SWG.

Open Space

Using a series of maps, LAFCO staff presented an overview of open space within the MSR focus area and immediate surroundings which included the Silverado/Modjeska Specific Plan area. The topics presented included:

- ◆ What kind of open space is present>definitions, use categories, restrictions

- ◆ How much is there>existing and projected
- ◆ Who owns, manages and/or maintains it
- ◆ What is the future status of open space in the area

The open space presentation ended by asking the group a three-part question to stimulate discussion:

- ◆ *Do we have enough open space today; How much do we want for the future; What are the alternatives for acquisition, management and governance of open space that benefits everyone to the bottom line of preserving open space?*

The group discussion that followed highlighted how some maps could be revised to more easily demonstrate ownership and connectivity between the various open space parcels. Most discussion revolved around the cost of oversight/ management of open space and identifying the possible options/alternatives to address that question.

The SWG generated the following questions for possible in-depth study regarding open space:

- ◆ **What is the value of open space?**
- ◆ **What kind of open space do we want?**
- ◆ **Is the amount of existing and proposed open space sufficient?**
- ◆ **What management, access and/or funding plans are needed for the next 20 years?**

Trails

Using a map, LAFCO staff presented an overview of the current and projected trails plan within the MSR focus area and immediate surroundings which included the Sil/Mod Specific Plan area.

The trails portion of the presentation concluded with a comprehensive open space trails question for group discussion:

- ◆ *What public/private funding sources, cooperative opportunities and implementation alternatives exist and are appropriate for the acquisition, management and governance of open space and trails for the benefit of everyone?*

The discussion centered on the visible lack of connectivity of trails throughout the area. It was also noted that though there is a lot of open space in the area, little of it is accessible. For trails in particular, there are several challenges that contribute to the lack of connectivity among them being private ownership of land and lands held under specific use restrictions such as conservation easements.

Traffic

Included in the trending data on traffic was current and projected traffic volumes for the area as well as capital projects in the area. The important connection for traffic to the MSR issue focus was presumed to be the impact population, housing and employment have on traffic and essentially, quality of life.

With the understanding that traffic flow will increase in the focus area, the SWG was presented with the following basic question of whether or not to study the issue of traffic further in a TAC:

- ◆ *Are the planned construction projects in the region adequate to maintain traffic flow at an acceptable level?*

There was little discussion on the question or the issue. One question was asked as to whether or not the traffic data reflected the currently proposed lower density East Orange development plan as opposed to the original, more densely populated plan. It was restated that the Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA) was the source of the projection data. Staff agreed to follow up with OCTA to verify the source of the volume projection data and the development plan on which the data is based.

General Municipal Services – Education, Libraries, Fire, Police

It was noted that police data was unavailable as of the meeting date and if available would be presented at the next SWG meeting.

Education

Graphs depicting current and future enrollments, per capita spending and information regarding capital facilities development, improvement and expansion projects were presented for the Orange Unified School District which is the educational service district for the area.

- ◆ *Are OUSD's plans adequate to facilitate increased enrollment while maintaining the same quality of education?*

There was little discussion on the question or the issue.

Libraries

The consultant showed a map depicting the current County and City library locations, the proposed City library upgrade projects and City's new East Orange area branch library locations within the MSR area.

The SWG was presented with the following basic question for regarding libraries:

- ◆ *Are the projected plans adequate to meet the needs of the growing community?*

There was little discussion on the question or the issue.

Fire

A map of current and proposed OCFA and City of Orange fire stations was the visual as the working group was provided information about average response times. It was noted that the proposed new fire station off Santiago Canyon Road, near Irvine Lake would decrease the current average canyon area call response time of 8:19 minutes.

A two-part question was posed to the working group for discussion on fire services:

- ♦ *Do opportunities exist to reduce overlap of service areas? How will future costs of providing fire services impact the region?*

There was little discussion on the question or the issue.

Gaps/Potential Eliminations

Subsequent to the presentation, the facilitator asked if the SWG had any additional questions to add to the list that had already been generated that it wanted for potential further consideration. Receiving no new questions, the facilitator led a general discussion about the topics considered during the meeting and asked if there were any conclusions that could be drawn. SWG members generally stated that they did not view *Education, Libraries and Traffic* as germane to the MSR process and may ultimately choose to eliminate these areas for consideration in their visioning work. The facilitator noted that this preliminary conclusion would not be final until all of the macro areas had been reviewed. However, it would be recorded for the SWG's future reference. Once the SWG has completed review of all eight macro issue areas the group will decide via consensus the issues it will eliminate for further consideration and the issues it will refer for further study and analysis by technical advisory committees.

A comment was made regarding a possible alternative approach to looking at service provision in the MSR focus area. It was mentioned that the service delivery question might be better approached by evaluating services comprehensively from the focus of geographic location (urban vs. rural) on the premise that it is more expensive and difficult to deliver services to the canyon areas for example than to locations within the city. LAFCO staff responded that the idea of looking at the canyon areas separately has been given some consideration. It may be useful to have a canyon discussion group outside the MSR to take on specific issues.

Response to Public Comments:

Three specific comments were made to the SWG during the public comment period. During the public comment period, members of the audience address the group regarding the following. The group was asked to comment on the following:

- ◆ Requests to move the public comment period to the end of the meetings;
- ◆ Add alternates to the general distribution list for meetings and materials and provide them with working group notebooks;
- ◆ Change the time of the meetings to allow those who work to attend.

Regarding Public Comment Period:

The facilitator reminded the working group and the audience that during meeting #1, the SWG reached consensus on the groundrules for public comments. Specifically that public comment period would be limited to a total of 15 minutes taken at the beginning of the meeting and three minutes per person.

Alternates:

The question of adding alternates to the distribution list and providing them with notebooks was directed toward LAFCO staff. LAFCO had no comment.

Change Meeting Time:

No working group member expressed support for the idea of changing the meeting time.

Also, the canyon resident who had expressed concern about the quality of life for canyon residents was encouraged to continue to attend the Stakeholder Working Group meetings.

Follow-up Items:

In response to specific questions raised during the presentation, staff agreed to provide the following information to the SWG:

- ◆ Verification of employment projection data for East Orange
- ◆ Clarification from OCTA regarding the source of the volume projection data and the development plan on which the data is based.
- ◆ Verification of the East Orange population data and number of housing units
- ◆ A copy of the trending data presentation on CD and associated data sources
- ◆ An MSR focus area map identifying service agency boundaries

Next Meeting:

The May meeting was cancelled due to insufficient time between meetings to gather and prepare data on the remaining four macro issues. The next meeting will be on June 4 and will cover trending data and information on the macro issues of: water/wastewater, infrastructure, governance and fiscal.

Adjournment

The meeting concluded and was adjourned at approximately 1:00 pm.